

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated March 24, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 10, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,275,061 B1 to Tomita in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003-0034944 to Kondoh et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,448,952 to Toyoda.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 8-11 and 15.

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Tomita fails to disclose or teach “control means controls the scanning driver circuit such that the liquid crystal display panel is scanned in a reverse-sequential manner upon testing of the liquid crystal display panel to display an image at an increased brightness”.

Kondoh does not supply this deficiency in Tomita. Kondoh discloses (para. [0047]) that a voltage waveform(a) is applied in a sequence to the scanning electrode starting at a first electrode and ending at a N-th electrode in the scanning period of the first frame (F1), but the voltage waveform(a) is applied in a reverse order starting at the N-th electrode and ending at the first electrode in the scanning period of the second frame (F2). Thus, the technical purpose and structure of Kondoh are different from those of the present invention.

In addition, as shown in FIG. 1, Toyoda discloses that a display panel is divided into a lower part and an upper part, both parts are separately and simultaneously scanned in opposite directions to write image on pixels on the respective scanning electrode.

That is, Toyoda is characterized in that the lower part of the display panel is scanned from the center toward the lower edge of the panel, while the upper part of the display panel is scanned from the center toward the upper edge of the panel in synchronism with the scanning of the lower panel. Accordingly, the technical purpose and structure of Toyoda are different from those of the present invention. Thus, Tomita, Kondoh, and Toyoda are not combinable in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, none of the cited reference including Tomita, Kondoh and Toyoda, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the present invention that the liquid crystal display panel is scanned in a reverse-sequential manner to display an image at an increased brightness upon testing of the liquid crystal display panel.

Accordingly, the rejections of claims 1-7, 10, 12-14 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. None of the cited references including Tomita, Knodoh, Weisbrod, Toyoda, Asada, and Henley, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention as recited in the amended claims.

Applicant believes the foregoing discussion places the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

George G. Ballas

Registration No.: 52,587

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant